



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

himself, in his preface to "Christabel"; but it does not allow for exceptional lines like the third, which has only four syllables, and the fifth, which has only six.

" 'Tis the middle of night by the castle clock,  
And the owls have awaken'd the crowing cock,  
Tu- whit! ——— Tu- whoo!  
And hark, again! the crowing cock,  
How drowsily it crew."

Evidently, Coleridge intended that the third line be read with two accents (the printing sometimes suggests that it has four) and two silent feet, and that the fifth line be read with three accents and one silent foot. It is only lines having four accents, then, that must have as many as seven syllables.

The style of the following sentence is not up to Professor Corson's standard; perhaps some clerical oversight is concerned:

"There is not, generally, in his [Marlowe's] plays, that sanity of mind and heart, that well-balanced and well-toned thought and genuine passion, to have brought out the higher capabilities of the verse" (p. 189).

It will surprise no one that Corson gives unqualified praise to the blank-verse of Robert Browning's "Ring and the Book" (pp. 224-6). Perhaps most of us, however, will agree with Professor Raymond, when he says that Browning, through the excessive use of ellipsis, "drifts into obscurity, and this, too, where there is no occasion for it in the sense, nor gain from it in the effect" ('Poetry as a Representative Art,' p. 164).

I think that the ear takes in many English stanzas as having a different primary form from that which they show to the eye. I hear in six groups the various parts of the stanza in Milton's hymn "On the Morning of Christ's Nativity," as follows:

1. 6 *xa* (with internal rhyme)
2. 6 *xa* (ending with a silent foot)
3. 6 *xa* (with internal rhyme)
4. 6 *xa* (ending with a silent foot, and rhyming with 2)
5. 6 *xa* (ending with two silent feet)
6. 6 *xa* (rhyming with 5).

In a similar way, my ear catches the stanza of Shelley's "Ode to a Skylark" as made up, fundamentally, of three lines of six accents each. The ear seems to grasp a stanza in

sound-groups of equal length, where that is practicable. I accept in full, however, Professor Corson's helpful remarks upon these two stanzas. We are certainly conscious of the relations that are brought out by the printed form. (Cf. 'Primer of Eng. V.,' pp. 136 and 140, and especially the suggestive quotation from Peter Bayne on p. 81.)

As a critic and interpreter of English poetry, Professor Corson has become a contemporaneous classic.

A. H. TOLMAN.

University of Chicago.

### GERMAN DRAMA.

*Maria Stuart.* Ein Trauerspiel von Friedrich Schiller. Edited (with introduction, English notes, genealogical tables, etc.) by KARL BREUL, Ph. D. Cambridge: University Press. 1893. 8vo, pp. xxxi, 272.

DR. BREUL enjoys already a wide reputation as an able and scholarly editor of German Classics. He has contributed five volumes to the Pitt Press Series, all of which contain very good work. In one point, however, he has laid himself open to serious criticism; he is entirely too prolix in his notes. In his edition of 'Tell' there are one hundred pages of notes (in fine print) to one hundred and forty-four pages of text; the whole book contains three hundred and thirty-three pages. The volume before us shows a marked improvement in this respect; there are only eighty-five pages of notes to one hundred and sixty-five pages of text, although the play itself is more difficult than 'Tell.' But the notes still contain much that is superfluous or out of place; they discuss not only grammatical and lexical difficulties, but also questions of etymology and historical grammar, with occasional references to Behaghel's 'Die deutsche Sprache,' Erdmann's 'Syntax,' Kluge's 'Etymological Dictionary' and other standard works.

Besides the text and the notes, the book also contains an introduction which has been wisely "restricted to what was absolutely necessary," and which comprises a summary of Schiller's life and works, a statement of the origin of the play, a criticism of its form and of its

contents in the light of history, and a rather elaborate 'argument'; there are, moreover, appendices giving the most important variant readings of the stage editions, and a carefully compiled bibliography; furthermore, an index to the notes and a genealogical table.

The summary of Schiller's life and works is rather meagre; a short biography of the poet should have been given in the introduction to 'Tell.' Some of the statements in the summary are misleading, others are inaccurate, partly owing to the fact that the practice of giving the year of the *publication* of each play is not uniformly adhered to: "Die Räuber, published in 1782" (evidently the tragedy is meant); Don Carlos *written in 1787*; "the plays which were *published* by him between 1799 and 1804, *with the interval of one year*," there being no such interval between the years of *publication*; "the first *three years* (1785-1787)," (in reality twenty-seven months); "in 1787 he migrated to Weimar, where he hoped to be able to settle down as an author" (he meant to make only a short visit); "*in 1794* he undertook a journey to his native country" (it was in 1793); Schiller's "Glocke" is classed among the "philosophical poems written in stanzas." This summary seems to have been written in great haste, and is not up to the editor's standard. The chapters on the history of the play and on its form and contents are very good.

The argument does not do justice to some of the scenes: all that is said of Act v, Scene 3, is "A cup of wine is ordered for Mary by her doctor" and of v, 14: "Davison informs her that the death warrant is in Burleigh's hands"; in v, 15 "Elizabeth finds herself abandoned by all her *servants*." There are also some inaccuracies; iii, 6: Bothwell did not win Mary by fear only, at least not in Schiller's play (cf. lines 325, 2584, 2588); v, 15: "Shrewsbury now resigns all his offices," when he has only one. A queer mistake is found under v, 10: "Leicester remains alone. The door is locked soon after by mistake, so that he cannot get out." The stage-directions clearly say that Leicester first advances towards the door through which Mary has left and which is still open, and then resolves to flee and turns to another door which, however, he finds locked.

The notes give too much help in many cases where the dictionary would readily solve the difficulty, or where the student should know enough grammar to make out the meaning of the passage; on the other hand, some lines, to which no reference is made, seem to call for an explanation (for example, 185f., 198, 228, 757). But it is always easy to disagree with an annotator on such questions. On the whole, the editor has shown excellent judgment in the selection of passages for annotation, and his explanations are generally clear and to the point. Occasionally we find an infelicity of expression, especially in the definitions (cf. the notes to 2141 and 3351). The note to 2641 (on *Ihro* and *Dero*) is misleading, though the editor probably meant to say the right thing. The same is the case in the note to 210, where he says that the "uninflected form of the adjective is now admissible only in poetry and before neuter nouns"; the insertion of the words "then only" after "and" would make the passage clear. The editor is at times also unfortunate in his translations of German words and phrases: *Brecheisen*, 'scrap iron' (Note to stage-direction, Act i, Sc. 1); 283 *Leidensproben*, 'proofs of sorrow' instead of 'trials and suffering'; 1644 *deine Frauengunst* 'thy woman's favor,' instead of simply 'thy love'; 1680 *dir angesonnen* 'has expected of you,' instead of 'has asked you to do'; 2063 *als vorher bedacht* 'as if thought out beforehand,' instead of 'as if premeditated'; 2552 *nur die Wut zu wecken* 'to arouse nothing but rage' (should be 'madness'); 3975 *Ich will nicht hoffen* 'I do not hope' instead of 'I hope (trust) you have not.' In the note to 1369 we read: *Umringt* means 'surrounded,' while *umrungen* is 'beset,' 'encompassed,' whatever this distinction may mean; but Schiller uses *umrungen* in several places for *umringt*.

A few errors occur in the notes relating to etymology or to historical grammar. Note to 49: the plural of *Freude* is now weak, not strong; 134, *nahtes* is itself formed after the analogy of *tages*; 160, *willens* is not an adverbial genitive sing., but a predicative genitive with the force of an adjective; 331, the weak form of the adjective is also used in the genitive plural after *aller*; 1732, the *l* in *Liebling*, *darling*, etc., is not inorganic, but is the

characteristic consonant of another diminutive suffix *il* (*el*, *al*); 2505, *Schuld* in the sense of 'guilt' does form a plural in archaic speech and in poetry (cf. Luther's *Und vergib uns unsre Schulden*, 2605); the O.H.G. adjective is *wanawizi*, more commonly *wanawizzi*, M.H.G. *wanawizze(c)*, not *wana wizi*, etc.

Other points in the notes: 86, the emendation is worse than the original; the simple fact is that the words *Da sie* are understood in line 88.—143. *hochfahrend* and *hochtrabend*, but *hochföhrtig*?—189. The final *e* is here required for the *Senkung*; it is elided only where it is superfluous.—251. *Unwillig* 'unwillingly,' but not 'unwilling.'—269. *Sonst* 'formerly.'—311. 'His brutal embrace,' not 'his foul embrace.'—329 and 2826. Bothwell himself stated in his will that he had won Mary's love only by means of magic potions.—2014. What do the words "now even" mean in this connection?—2352. Aug. 24-25, not 23-24.—2422. Quotation from Wallenstein: *verführt*, not *verführte*. P. 255, Elizabeth is *obliged* to banish Lord Burleigh?

We have noticed only two misprints: p. xxiv *Darley* for *Darnley*; note to 2769, *bosen* for *bösen*.

The book is attractively gotten up and is, on the whole, despite its defects in matters of detail, one of the best school editions now available.

HUGO K. SCHILLING.

Harvard University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur* von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts. Von JOHANN KELLE. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz (Bessersche Buchhandlung), 1892. 8vo, pp. 435.

WACKERNAGEL's history of German literature and Kögel's treatise on High and Low German literature in Paul's 'Grundriss' make one at first doubt the *raison d'être* of such a book as this. The method of treatment pursued by Kelle differs, however, so much from either Wackernagel's or Kögel's, the book before us is so scholarly throughout, and its author shows such thorough acquaintance with the latest investigations, that it will soon

find a place among the standard works on the subject.

In eight chapters or "books" the author presents (without a word of introduction, a very commendable proceeding) the history of German literature from the oldest times to the death of Konrad II (1039). Clearness and directness characterize the style throughout. Wherever it is possible (and this adds an important element of value to the book), the author shows the political background of the period under discussion. The position of the Franks and their influence on the evolution of German literature is brought out with skill, as is also the part played by Christianity in the development of German culture and the German language.

Kelle's literary criticisms are less satisfactory than his method of presentation. The discussion of the Hildebrandslied and of the Heliand lacks vividness, and, to our mind, the author exaggerates Otfried's merit.

The arrangement of the book leaves room for improvement. The text contains much that belongs to the notes; for example, the long discussions of the texts. In the notes Kelle might have followed Kögel's example and characterized with a few words the most important books he mentions. One is plunged into long lists of works which are meaningless to all who have not worked in the particular field of German literature they deal with.

On p. 3 we find mention of the "asiatische Urheimat" of the Germans. It is certainly unwise to make such a statement without in some way referring to the theory of the European home of the Aryan races. On pp. 4 ff. Kelle reproduces in detail Cæsar's and Tacitus's accounts of Germany, where it would have been very much more satisfactory to give the results of modern investigations, or at least state where the ancient sources are not reliable. So the sentence "Jeder Staat suchte möglichst weite Einöden und Wüsteneien an seinen Grenzen zu haben" (p. 4) needs a comment (cf. Dahn, 'Urgeschichte,' pp. 72-73).

Why ask, on p. 119, whether the poet of the Heliand clothed his subject-matter in popular garb simply as a concession to his public or because he was brought up in such views,